

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1-11 and 13-15 are currently being amended. No new matter is added.

Claim 12 is requested to be cancelled, without prejudice.

Claims 16-18 are being added. No new matter is added.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-11 and 13-18 are now pending in this application.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3, and 8-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,434,482 to Oshida et al. (“Oshida”).

The Examiner stated that:

Oshida et al. disclose a GPS receiver on line 23, column 4; a database including road network and POI information on lines 24-25, on column 4; a microprocessor coupled to the GPS and to the database for providing display output signals representing highway exits in the vicinity of the current vehicle location on line 31, on column 4, and lines 1-4, on column 5; an operator actuated switch on lines 5-8, on column 5; and a display for selectively displaying the exits on a highway on which the vehicle is traveling, wherein the microprocessor is programmed to respond to the operator input signals to provide a scroll-forward display of upcoming highway exits and for displaying POI accessible at such highway exits on

lines 2-4, on column 5; the POI information includes several categories in Figure 3; each establishment is identified by name and address on line 32, on column 8; the microprocessor responds to operator input signals to provide a scroll-backward display of passed highway exits and POI accessible at such highway exits on line 28, on column 4; only POIs within a predetermined range are displayed on the range is less than about four miles on lines 13-14, on column 6; the operator actuated switch allows the operator to select POIs and display distance, direction, and detailed information to the POI on lines 5-27, on column 5; updating the road network and POI information separately on lines 43-49, on column 6; and including a compass coupled to the display on line 20, on column 4.

Claim 1 is in independent form and recites (as amended) a “control system for mounting in a vehicle” comprising, in combination with other elements, a “microprocessor ... configured to use the user selection to switch between at least (a) causing an electronic display to display addresses on the street on which the vehicle is traveling and (b) causing the electronic display to display names of cross-streets ahead of and behind the vehicle.” Claims 2-11 and 13-15 depend from independent Claim 1.

Oshida is directed to an “on-vehicle navigation system” that “displays for searching facilities located within a specified distance from the next exit of a highway on which the vehicle is traveling, and facilities located within a specific distance from the vehicle which are located along the guide route” (see Oshida at col. 1, lines 8-13; and Figure 4).

Oshida does not mention using a received user selection to switch between:

- (a) displaying addresses on a street on which the vehicle is traveling, and
- (b) displaying cross street names ahead of and behind the vehicle.

Rather, Oshida only appears to disclose using a user selection to specifically select a point of interest and to display a guide route to the point of interested based on the received user selection (see Oshida, col. 5, lines 5-26; Oshida, Fig. 4 Flow Chart; Oshida, Claims).

Accordingly, Oshida does not identically disclose a “control system for mounting in a vehicle” comprising, among other elements, a “microprocessor ... configured to use the user selection to switch between at least (a) causing an electronic display to display addresses on a street on which the vehicle is traveling and (b) causing the electronic display to display names of cross-streets ahead of and behind the vehicle,” as recited in independent Claim 1. Claim 1 is patentable over Oshida. Dependent Claims 2-11 and 13-15, which depend from independent Claim 1, are also patentable. See 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 4.

The Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1, 3, 8-11, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

For at least the same reasons as explained above with reference to Claim 1, Oshida does not identically disclose a “method for displaying information selected by a user in a vehicle” comprising, among other steps, a “using the control circuit to process the received user selection and to cause an electronic display to switch between displaying at least (a) addresses on a street on which the vehicle is traveling and (b) names of cross-streets ahead of and behind the vehicle based on the second input,” as recited in new independent Claim 16. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 16 is patentable over Oshida. New dependent Claim 17, which depends from independent Claim 16, is also patentable. See 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 4.

For at least the same reasons as explained above with reference to Claim 1, Oshida does not identically disclose a “control system” comprising, among other elements, a “circuit using the received user selection to switch between causing a coupled electronic display to represent at least (a) addresses on a street on which the vehicle is traveling and (b) names of cross-streets ahead of and behind the vehicle based on the user selection,” as recited in independent Claim 20. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 20 is patentable over Oshida.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

On page 3 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected Claims 4-7 as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,434,482 to Oshida et al. (“Oshida”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,991,690 to

Murphy (“Murphy”) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). On page 4 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected Claims 14 and 15 as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,434,482 to Oshida et al. (“Oshida”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,351,698 to Kubota et al. (“Kubota”) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants respectfully submit that Murphy and Kubota do not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Claim 1 and that Claims 4-7, 14, and 15 are patentable over any valid combination of Oshida, Murphy, and Kubota for at least the reasons stated above with respect to Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 4-7, 14, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date December 1, 2008

By / Karl F. Reichenberger /

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 26371
Telephone: (414) 297-5571
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Karl F. Reichenberger
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 42,308